

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/643,620 | DONGES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Thomas A. Morrison | 3653 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowance

(1) Thomas A. Morrison.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. William Gehris (Reg. No. 38,156).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

9,13,14 and 16

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Kathy Matecki

KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Thomas Morrison
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Contacted Mr. Gehris (applicant's representative) to get permission to amend claim 16 to positively claim the function performed by the delivery device, as per the attached examiner's amendment. Mr. Gehris approved such changes to claim 16. The changes needed for claim 16 were specifically discussed and approved during the telephone conversation. The same changes were needed for claim 9. Thus, the same changes to claim 9 are included in the attached examiner's amendment. During the telephone conversation the examiner also asked if the limitations recited in claims 13 and 14 are shown in the drawings. In response, Mr. Gehris explained that elements 11a, 11b and 11c shown in Fig. 4 can be considered the three movable closing elements, as set forth in claim 13. Also, he mentioned that the specification (e.g., paragraph [0029]) indicates that elements 11a, 11b and 11c are roller shutters, as set forth in claim 14. Thus, it was clarified that the elements of claims 13 and 14 are shown in the drawings.